

the divine right of Protestantism, you Sir, and your contemporaries, maintained a most discreet silence: in those days we heard nothing about the "contentious and hostile spirit" which you now, when it is too late, so eloquently bewail. It is a pity that your denunciations against "a contentious and hostile spirit" did not burst forth, when the "hostility and contention" were all on one side.

I fully agree with you, Sir, that "a contentious and hostile spirit" is not the spirit in which religious, or indeed any, questions should be discussed. But, Sir, you will please to remember that the questions which Catholics, in self-defence, are called upon to argue with their Protestant opponents, are not questions of dogma at all. Whether the doctrines of the Catholic Church are in accordance with the Faith delivered to the Apostles—whether the Pope be the legitimate successor of St. Peter—or a "Spiritual despot"—are questions upon which you and I may entertain totally different opinions, and which we might discuss without "contention or hostility." Whether you be a Protestant after the order of Jonathan Edwards, or of Theodore Parker, is to me a matter of perfect indifference; one with which I have no business to interfere, and for which, most assuredly, I should never dream of calling you to account, or treating you in "a contentious or hostile spirit." And were these, or questions like these, the sole points at issue between Catholics and Protestants, doubtless the controversy might be conducted without acrimony, and like a good respectable logomachy, unintelligible to many, uninteresting, and unprofitable to all; for I do not believe that religious conversions can be effected through the medium of a newspaper, or that the ministrations of the printer's devil can adequately supersede the agency of God's Holy Spirit. In a word, without subscribing to the doctrine—"that Scriptures out of church is blasphemous"—I incline to the opinion that they are out of place when dragged—neck and crop—into the columns of a weekly newspaper.

It is not then his dogmas, nor the Church that the Catholic controversialist is called upon to defend; they can take care of themselves, and there is One on High who has promised to watch over them. But when our civil rights are assailed—when it is proposed to deprive us of our rights as freemen, by preventing us from disposing as we will of our own, and by compelling us to support a system of wholesale proselytism, under the specious guise of National, or State, Education, then, Sir, it is the right, it is the duty of every Catholic to protest, in words—and in deeds if necessary—against these monstrous encroachments upon his rights as a freeman, and as a Christian. Sir, you may deprecate the "contentious and hostile spirit" in which these questions are discussed, but you must remember that, if revolutions are not made with rose-water, so neither, with fair words, and honied phrases, can the momentous interests, now at stake on the issue of the contest between Catholicity and Protestantism, be adjusted. The combat has not been of our seeking; it has been forced on us: a Non-Catholic majority claims the right of compelling us, Catholics, to pay for, and support, a Non-Catholic system of education. "As the Lord liveth we will do no such thing!"—is the reply that we hurl back to our enemies. "We seek not to dictate to you, and you shall not dictate to us, in this matter. If you threaten, we defy your threats, and laugh your menaces to scorn.—So come the battle when it may—and God defend the right!"

We have also, Sir, to defend ourselves, and the characters of those whom we justly revere and love, from the assaults of dastardly slanderers; and it is here Sir, that I would specially call attention to the inconsistency of your present conduct. You admit today that it was the constant, and unprovoked abuse poured by certain organs of "vital religion," upon the creed and worship of Catholics, that called into being the *True Witness*. You frankly—and it does you credit—you frankly admit the unmerited, unprovoked, malignity of the attack, and yet you profess to wonder at the asperity of the rejoinder. Sir, you know not what you say—For Catholics to answer mildly the wanton attacks that have been levelled at them, would prove them either, less than men, or more than angels. Sir, Catholics are but men; they have feelings, senses, affections, passions, as other men have; yes, even the "debased and degraded" Irish Papists—are men, though the Rev. Mr. Taylor will hardly admit it—if you prick them do they not bleed? if you insult them shall they not reply? and if, in so doing—a little of the "old Adam"—as the conventicle has it—should now and then break out, is it for you, Sir, or your friends, who witnessed with unmoved complacency the unprovoked attack, to complain of the "contentious and hostile spirit" of the defence?

How, Sir, would you act in similar circumstances, and under like provocation? Sir, I will suppose a case. Suppose, for instance, that the *True Witness* had put in circulation a charge of kidnapping, false imprisonment, and attempted murder, and had insinuated gross immorality, against a gentleman whom you, as an Episcopalian, must revere as your Bishop—and spiritual guide—and for whose virtues and unobtrusive gentlemanly demeanour, all men, of all religious persuasions, entertain the highest respect. Suppose, Sir, that the *True Witness* had been called upon by—say the *Commercial Advertiser*—"to give up his authority and produce his proofs, or else to retract and apologise"—suppose that instead of doing either the one or the other, the *True Witness* had persisted in the calumny—that his conduct in so doing had been approved of by some, condemned by none, of the Catholic press in this country—and that its columns were subsequently constantly filled with letters, purporting to be from Catholic Priests, testifying to their unqualified belief in the writer's veracity—and eulogistic of his services in the cause of truth—suppose also, Sir, that this was but one, of many similar instances—what, Sir, would I ask, would be your conduct—what your language—what the "spirit" in which you would meet such an opponent? and in what terms would you speak of the Catholic press? Sir, I need not ask. You are a man of education, and, I faint believe a gentleman, and a man of honor—you would not stoop to weigh your words, or nicely to measure your expressions of indignant disgust; you would at once treat your opponent as a liar and a scoundrel deserves to be treated, and you would say that his abettors, and encouragers were partakers of his infamy. Sir, for so doing, old women might blame, your "contentious and hostile spirit"—but your own conscience would not reproach you; nor would God condemn you.

Now Sir, the case, that hitherto I have only supposed, is an actual occurrence, the relative positions of libeller and libelled alone being reversed; but that surely can not, in your estimation, affect its merits. In the month of May last, the *Montreal Witness* accused the Jesuit Fathers, the conductors of St. Mary's college

of this city—gentlemen, whom Catholics revere and love as much, Sir, as you, your Bishop, and who, as ecclesiastics, as men of retired and unobtrusive habits, are as much entitled to courteous language and treatment, as any Protestant minister or clergyman—of having incarcerated, and attempted to murder, a member of their order, because the latter had threatened to make certain revelations as to their gross immorality. The *True Witness* called upon the other *Witness* "to give up his authority, and produce his proofs, or else to retract and apologise"—instead of doing either the one or the other, the *Montreal Witness* persisted in his calumny, and not one of the Protestant press of Canada raised its voice in reprobation of such conduct; on the contrary, its columns have constantly been filled with letters purporting to be from Protestant ministers, and members of various Protestant denominations, all testifying to their unqualified belief in the writer's veracity, and eulogistic of his services in the cause of truth. Sir, I ask you, how can you consistently "condemn the contentious and hostile spirit" of the *True Witness*, after having allowed the infamous conduct of the *Montreal Witness* in May last, and of its abettors and encouragers ever since, to pass unnoticed, uncondemned? Is not this lying slander upon the Jesuits, Sir, a pleasant practical commentary on the Rev. Mr. Jenkins' "Resolution" at the French Canadian Missionary Society meeting, which you notice approvingly—"that the object of that Society will be more effectually secured by speaking the truth in love." Sir, these are fine words, to catch fools withal; but, I say it Sir, without disparagement to your years, which ought to bring wisdom—"that you are too old a bird to be caught with such chaff."

I might adduce many more instances of similar discrepancy of conduct on your part, but I should but weary you. I will turn to another passage of your article which has subjected you to the burden of reading, and me, of making, this vindication of the "spirit" of the *True Witness*. You say that—"if the *Montreal Witness* were mentally qualified to teach, or its hostile disparaging—the *True Witness*—publicly authorised to instruct" you might be "silent." As to the mental qualifications of the *Montreal Witness*, I have not one word to say; I believe him to be as fair a representative of the intellectuality of the system which he advocates, as he is of its morality and truthfulness; if you design to "write him down an ass," do so, but lay not the sin on the *True Witness*—"Thou canst not say I did it"—nor shall I attempt to bring you to book for it. But you would keep silent if the *True Witness* were "publicly authorised to instruct." What mean you by this, Sir? or what "authority to instruct" is it that you require? You profess to be a Protestant; is it not then, a little unreasonable—rather inconsistent—on your part, to complain that the *True Witness* is not "publicly authorised to instruct?" An authority to instruct implies an obligation, upon all, to hearken to, and obey, that authorised instructor—and is therefore incompatible with the fundamental principle of Protestantism—the right of private judgment. You have therefore no right to complain of the *True Witness*, because not "publicly authorised to instruct"—for, as a Protestant, you deny the possibility of such an authority. Pray good Sir, learn to be a little more consistent and logical. But to ease your scruples, Sir, I may as well assure you, that the *True Witness* pretends not to have any "public authority to instruct"—nay—does not presume to set itself up as an instructor at all. Sir, I am a Catholic layman—not a teacher, but a learner—a humble learner from the lips of those who, by Christ, have been "publicly authorised to instruct" all nations: and yet—I say it advisedly—I am just as much "publicly authorised to instruct" as any Protestant minister in Christendom—whether he be a member, of the State Clergy of the Anglican establishment, or of the Aaronic Priesthood of the Mormonites—whether he be a nominee of Dr. Sumner, or of Joe Smith, the last Protestant Prophet. Worthless as my authority to instruct may be, it is fully as good as that of any of, or of all, these men, who, Sir, nevertheless, do set themselves up as masters in Israel. If, Sir, I object not to their want of a "public authority," you can have no right to reproach me with being in a similar predicament. I might cite an ancient and appropriate apothegm—something about the "pot and the kettle"—but though appropriate it is not elegant, and as it might be objected to as unscriptural, I will not repeat it.

To recapitulate—You are obnoxious to the charge of indiscretion, Sir, in that you, the conductor of a professedly secular journal, go out of your way to involve yourself in a dispute with the *True Witness*—a dispute which most certainly I have not sought, but from which most assuredly, I will never shrink. This, Sir, is, on the part of one professing to be a lover of peace and concord, highly indiscreet; it argues Sir—you will pardon me for saying it—it argues that you have—"unbeknownst" perhaps, as Mrs. Gamp would say—some Celtic blood in you, some of that hot blood which makes those in whose veins it circulates so fond of a fray, that they cannot see, or hear the din of, one, without, perforce, thrusting themselves into the midst of the mêlée.

You are also justly liable to the charge of inconsistency. It is now too late for you Sir, to come forward as a peace-maker, or as a denouncer of broils. These denunciations would have been appropriate, might have been effective, some years ago, when, as you yourself admit, the Catholics of this Province were the victims of unprovoked and unmerited abuse. You let slip the occasion; then, Sir—perhaps you enjoyed the fun of seeing a Popish Priest reviled, and a Sister of Charity treated as if she were an outcast in the streets; at all events, you did, or said, nothing to testify your displeasure. You have, therefore, Sir, lost the right of interposing to-day. I do not contest your right to rebuke those who interfere with you, or who attribute to you lax notions upon Sabbath observances: to those who attack or misrepresent you, you do well to show fight—but, Sir, I would recommend you not to meddle with the

EDITOR OF THE TRUE WITNESS.

Montreal, Feb. 8, 1853.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

MR. EDITOR—Many thanks to you for your admirable defence of my poor countrymen, which appeared in the last number of your excellent paper. You are entitled to the warmest gratitude of every Irishman, not only in Montreal, but in America. The most false, and the most foul statements, touching their morality, and ascribed to their religion as the cause, were impudently uttered by a person who claims to be classed with gentlemen. I trust that your able refutation of the lying statements of that very unscrupulous man,

who is not ashamed to call himself a preacher of the gospel truths, may teach him better manners in future. The French Canadian Missionary Society's agents are everywhere scouted by the faithful Catholic children of old Erin; they have too much good sense to allow themselves to be seduced by these retailers of lies; and therefore they are abused and calumniated by the meek missionary, and this abuse is applauded by his self-righteous auditors. Your scathing exposure of the rotten state to which Protestantism has reduced England and Scotland, placed side by side, with the pure morals of my countrymen, and this too on Protestant testimony, should open the eyes of these shameless revilers of my country and of Catholicity—if any thing could open the eyes of such deluded fanatics. The comparison made by you, Sir, is a practical proof, if such were needed, that Catholicity effectually teaches holiness of life, and that Protestantism does not effectually teach holiness of life, although it pretends to do so. How could it be otherwise? In England, more thought is given to the making of fine steam-coaches, and fine steam-boats, than to the making life holy. There, men would like to have the honor, without the trouble, of becoming saints. To seek first the Kingdom of God and His justice, is a maxim too antiquated for these men of progress. No wonder, therefore, that a system, which makes the carnal spirit predominant in men, is found to produce the fruits that are proper to that spirit. These modern representatives of the old Sadducees have even the folly to attempt to justify themselves by the authority of St. Paul, as if it were not plain to any one who reads his epistles, that his great object is to make men zealous in the pursuit of heavenly things, and to inspire them with a contempt of earthly things. They are not ashamed to belie our priests, to represent them as "a set of greedy misers, who take good care of themselves, and yet who advise others to despise riches." The hypocrites! they see our priests making every effort to procure relief for the poor, and they are stung with envy when our priests get the means of doing it, fearing that their own character for superior kindness to the poor, suffers thereby. They know that the priests instruct us to take more care of the soul, than of the body; while they, at the same time, teach us, that it would be criminal to neglect either; that a Christian must not be over-solicitous about earthly things; but that having given a reasonable attention to the business of this world, his chief care must be given to the concerns of the soul. Protestant bishops leave at their death a fine property to their families; Catholic Bishops, like the Bishop of Ardagh, who died the other day, leave barely enough to pay their debts. We can easily imagine a dialogue like the following, between a Methodist missionary and a simple, uneducated, but honest Irishman:—Missionary query—"Well, Pat, I think you are very silly to allow yourself to be hoodwinked by the priests; they keep you in the dark for their own selfish ends; they hide from you the Word of God, in order that they may be able to coax your money from you. If you take the Word of God from me, you will not be poor and miserable as you are." "Trot, sir," replies Pat, "it's little money the priest gets from me, for I haven't any, and if I had, he'd have it with a heart and a half, for the priest is our best friend; he preaches from the Bible, the true Word of God." "More fool you; then, to think so, Pat," rejoined the missionary; "don't you see how comfortable we make them who take our Bible, and join our meetings; why does not the priest do the same for his poor?" "Faix, then," says Pat, "it's easy for you to make your people comfortable and rich, for you are well paid for your unholy work, you set of ranting knaves. The gold of England is freely spent to fatten you and your little ones, and to enable you besides, by your mutilated Bible, which rests on no authority but that of King James I., to seduce others from the true faith, to follow your sect which is but of yesterday; you were not known till John Wesley's time; but the priests are from the days of the Apostles. The poor priest is hard-pinched to make out a living for himself, and he earns it well too, which you don't do; he has hard work too, which you have not; besides, if he has anything to spare when dying—having no little ones of his own—his savings go to the little ones of Christ; the priest lives and dies for them; but you live and die for yourself and the little missionaries. As for the comforts you offer, they are only a trifle when compared to what Satan offered to my Savior; and it appears that Satan has still great hopes of getting many into his service by means of the riches and glory of the kingdoms of the earth. Ah! sir, they are rather sour promises that have hell at the tail of them." "But," said the missionary, "how can that religion be true which encourages idolatry, and gives so high a place to the Virgin Mary?" "O," cried Pat, "a pretty missionary, indeed, must you be to know so little about religion as to call that honor we pay to the Holy Virgin, idolatry. If it be, the angel Gabriel was guilty of idolatry, and I don't want better example than the angel Gabriel." Pat knew his catechism, and so Satan, in the shape of a missionary, left him; then his angel guardian came to refresh him, with new grace. By the bye, the *Commercial Advertiser* is grown very wise of late.—The *True Witness* he is unable to meet in argument, and therefore he discovers that it is a great misfortune that such a newspaper should be published. He says, indeed, that it was necessary that there should be such a paper to defend the Catholics against the lies of the false *Witness*; he would willingly banish the latter, for the sake of not having the unpleasant truths told by the former. Let all Protestant journalists remember that there was no one to say a word in defence of Catholics, until the *True Witness* appeared. If Protestants are vexed at its appearance, let them ascribe it to the true cause, their own bigotry and want of charity to the Catholics and their religion.—The *Gazette*, too, feels very uneasy about your loyalty. Does the *Gazette* forget the sort of loyalty it displayed in inciting a ruffian mob to the burning of the Parliament House in this city. Let him wash his lips before he begins to tax you with disloyalty.

I am Sir, yours, &c., A CRT.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Sir—"Point d'argent, point de Suisse," says the old adage; and again, "El animal que mas se semeja a un hombre, es un suizo." These two proverbs were brought to my mind in listening the other evening to the Report of the French Canadian Missionary Society. According to the Spanish proverb, "the animal which most resembles man, is a Swiss or Colporteur;" and I could not but think that the assurance of these creatures who, with their "Reports" confessing the utter failure of their labors, came forward

asking for more money to gild the Canadians, since they cannot convert them, was almost equal to that of the smooth-faced rogues of the Montreal Provident and Savings' Bank, their principal patrons. But "no money no Swiss," says the other proverb; and to supply this great sinew of war, their agents perambulate Great Britain and Yankee-land, telling silly lies, and coaxing old women out of their spare cash and hall-worn inexpressibles; and now the *Montreal Witness* seems to expect that government officials are to step out of their way to patronise the proselyte-making shop at Pointe aux Trembles, and complains bitterly that Dr. Nelson, in his late admirable Report on Prisons, has not deigned so much as to notice, what the *Montreal Witness* calls, the model farm school at Pointe aux Trembles. Now, I have known that establishment for many years, and I am sure that, to a great many others, the information that it is a model farm school will be as new as it was to me. I had, indeed, supposed that they raised a little pork and potatoes for "the glory of God," as D. Amaron says in his Report for extending the "Redeemer's Kingdom;" but I presume that the worthy Doctor had never heard of it in any other light.

I recommend the F. C. M. people to use any influence they may possess, in inducing his Excellency the Governor-General to call attention to their establishment in his speech at the opening of Parliament, and to recommend a legislative grant, if the country wishes any longer to retain the services of these Swiss gentry, whose friends have no longer the Montreal Provident and Savings' Bank to fall back upon,—remembering that "point d'argent, point de Suisse."—Yours truly,

JOHN

THE ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE OF ART—By John Armour, Great St. James Street, Montreal.

We have received the February number of this publication, which fully sustains the reputation of the preceding number. The illustrations comprise every kind of subject, and are as handsome specimens of the engraver's art as we ever met with.

THE METROPOLITAN—A Catholic Magazine published by Murphy & Co., Baltimore.

A careful perusal of the January number of the Metropolitan has given us much pleasure. It is purely Catholic, and we highly recommend it to the Catholics of Canada.

MONTREAL EYE AND EAR INSTITUTION:

The Annual Meeting of the Subscribers was held at the Office of the Institution on Wednesday, 26th January last. Isidore Mallon, Esq., in the Chair. The Chairman having briefly stated the objects of the meeting, the Secretary read the following Report:—

Gentlemen,—I have much pleasure in laying before you, the Seventh Report of the Montreal Eye and Ear Institution, by which you will perceive, that the number of Patients treated gratuitously for diseases incidental to the Eye and Ear, during the year 1852, has been three hundred and ten, which I have added to two thousand and two hundred and twenty-one, being the number treated up to January 1852, make a total of two thousand five hundred and thirty-one Patients, since the Institution was first opened.

You will, no doubt, be surprised to find that there has been a decrease of Patients, since the last year; but I have much pleasure in stating that the cause is most satisfactory, which is, that being Ophthalmic and Aural Surgeon to St. Patrick's Hospital, I now receive into that Institution those cases which require Hospital treatment.

By the accompanying tabular statement, you will find that at your Institution there have been very few cases treated during the past year requiring important operations, and less of the severer forms of disease of the eyes. The few that have been treated were received only because the Hospital could not accommodate them. For the particulars of the cases which presented themselves for treatment, at your Institution during the past year, I beg leave to refer you to the annexed tabular statement.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your Obedt. Servant,

HENRY HOWARD, M.R.C.S.L.

Surgeon to the Montreal Eye and Ear Institution, Ophthalmic and Aural Surgeon to St. Patrick's Hospital.

Montreal, January 26th, 1853.

Here follows a report of cures of diseases of the Eye and Ear, which want of space compels us to omit.

RESULTS OF TREATMENT.

Diseases of the Eye—Cured,	190
" " " Relieved,	61
" " " Incurable,	8
Under treatment,	17
	269
Diseases of the Ear—Cured,	12
" " " Relieved,	10
" " " Incurable,	6
Under treatment,	4
	41

Extract from Treasurer's Report.

LIABILITIES OF THE INSTITUTION.

Balance due Messrs. B. Workman & Co.,	£26 16 0
Do do John Leeming, Esq.,	8 13 1
	£35 8 1

Mr. Lovell has given his usual donation, viz: that of printing the Circulars of the Institution gratuitously.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Moved by J. Sudler, seconded by Mr. Cunningham,

That the Report now read be adopted.

Moved by Mr. Leeming, seconded by Mr. Devlin,

That John Collins, Esq., be requested to undertake the duties of Treasurer and Secretary of this Institution for the ensuing year.

Moved by H. J. Larkin, seconded by G. E. Clerk,

That a Committee, consisting of three, viz:—Alfred LaRocque, T. Mallon, D. Lanigan—be appointed to take measures to liquidate the present claims against the Institution, and to provide means for the demands of the current year.

Moved by J. Fitzpatrick, seconded by John Mullin,

That our best thanks are justly due to John Leeming, Esq., for his untiring and disinterested labors in forwarding this truly laudable undertaking.

Moved by J. Collins, seconded by D. Lanigan,

That the thanks of this meeting are hereby tendered to Doctor Henry Howard, the Surgeon of the Montreal Eye and Ear Institution, for the unremitting attention which he has manifested in the careful and successful discharge of his duties for the relief of the suffering poor of this Province, who have required his professional services; and that his having continued these services gratuitously during a period of more than six years, entitle him to the most grateful commendations of every friend of suffering humanity.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman, terminated the proceedings.

I. MALLON, Chairman.

JOHN COLLINS, Secretary.

Birth.

In this city, on the 5th instant, Madame Alfred LaRocque, of a son.

Died.

In this city, on the 5th inst., after a long and painful illness, which was borne with christian resignation, Judith Shea, wife of Mr. Joseph Drummond. She was a native of Bradford, County Clare, Ireland. May she rest in peace.—Anon.